



# United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
08/308,219	09/19/1994	MARC ALIZON	3495.001020	4832
22852	7590 04/13/2004		EXAMINER	
FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW, GARRETT & DUNNER LLP 1300 I STREET, NW WASHINGTON, DC 20005			FREDMAN, JEFFREY NORMAN	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1637	
			DATE MAILED: 04/13/200-	4

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	08/308,219	ALIZON ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Jeffrey Fredman	1637				
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	6(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tin within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) day ill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	nely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
·— ·						
,						
•	-					
closed in accordance with the practice under E	x parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 45	53 O.G. 213.				
Disposition of Claims						
4) Claim(s) 17-25 is/are pending in the application	4) Claim(s) 17-25 is/are pending in the application.					
• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.					
5)⊠ Claim(s) <u>17-22</u> is/are allowed.						
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>23-25</u> is/are rejected.						
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.	☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to.					
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	election requirement.					
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.						
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).						
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	aminer. Note the attached Office	Action or form PTO-152.				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:	priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)	)-(d) or (f).				
<ol> <li>Certified copies of the priority documents</li> </ol>	s have been received.					
2. Certified copies of the priority documents						
3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior		ed in this National Stage				
application from the International Bureau	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •					
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list	of the certified copies not receive	ed.				
Attachment(s)						

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-326 (Rev. 1-04)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)

6) Other: \_\_

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.

Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

Art Unit: 1637

### **DETAILED ACTION**

## Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.129(a)

1. Since this application is eligible for the transitional procedure of 37 CFR 1.129(a), and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(r) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action is hereby withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.129(a). Applicant's first submission after final filed on December 19, 2003 has been entered.

# Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

- 2. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:
  - The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.
- 3. Claims 23-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

In analysis of the claims for compliance with the written description requirement of 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, the written description guidelines note regarding genus/species situations that "Satisfactory disclosure of a ``representative number" depends on whether one of skill in the art would recognize that the applicant was in possession of the necessary common attributes or features of the elements possessed by the members of the genus in view of the species disclosed." (See: Federal Register: December 21, 1999 (Volume 64, Number 244), revised guidelines for written description.)

Art Unit: 1637

Claims 23-25 encompass a genus of nucleic acids which are different from those disclosed in the specification due to the use of the hybridizing language. The genus includes variants for which no written description is provided in the specification. This large genus is represented in the specification by only the particularly described sequences as shown in the figures of the specification. Thus, applicant has express possession of only one particular HIV-1 genomic sequence, that given in claim 17, in a genus which comprises hundreds of millions of different possibilities. Here, no common element or attributes of the sequences are disclosed which would be conserved among the different members of the genus. Further, these claims encompass alternately spliced versions of the proteins, allelic variants including insertions and mutations, inactive precursor proteins which have a removable amino terminal end, and only specific amino acid sequences have been provided. No written description of alleles, of upstream or downstream regions containing additional sequence, or of alternative splice variants has been provided in the specification.

It is noted in the recently decided case <u>The Regents of the University of</u>

<u>California v. Eli Lilly and Co. 43 USPQ2d 1398 (Fed. Cir. 1997)</u> decision by the CAFC that

"A definition by function, as we have previously indicated, does not suffice to define the genus because it is only an indication of what the gene does, rather than what it is. See Fiers, 984 F.2d at 1169-71, 25 USPQ2d at 1605-06 (discussing Amgen). It is only a definition of a useful result rather than a definition of what achieves that result. Many such genes may achieve that result. The description requirement of the patent statute requires a description of an invention, not an indication of a result that one might achieve if one made that invention. See In re Wilder, 736 F.2d 1516, 1521, 222 USPQ 369, 372-73 (Fed. Cir. 1984) (affirming rejection

Art Unit: 1637

because the specification does "little more than outlin[e] goals appellants hope the claimed invention achieves and the problems the invention will hopefully ameliorate."). Accordingly, naming a type of material generally known to exist, in the absence of knowledge as to what that material consists of, is not a description of that material. "

In the current situation, the definition of the HIV-1 sequences as anything which "hybridizes to the DNA of claim 17" lack any specific structure. This is precisely the situation of naming a type of material which is generally known to likely exist, but, except for the specific sequence of claim 17, is in the absence of knowledge of the material composition and fails to provide descriptive support for the generic claim to any sequence which "hybridizes to the DNA of claim 17".

It is noted that in <u>Fiers v. Sugano</u> (25 USPQ2d, 1601), the Fed. Cir. concluded that

"...if inventor is unable to envision detailed chemical structure of DNA sequence coding for specific protein, as well as method of obtaining it, then conception is not achieved until reduction to practice has occurred, that is, until after gene has been isolated...conception of any chemical substance, requires definition of that substance other than by its functional utility."

The current situation is a definition of the compound solely but its functional utility, as a sequence which "hybridizes to the DNA of claim 17", without any definition of the particular changes permitted by the "hybridization" language.

In the instant application, certain specific SEQ ID NOs are described. Also, in Vas-Cath Inc. v. Mahurkar (19 USPQ2d 1111, CAFC 1991), it was concluded that:

<sup>&</sup>quot;...applicant must also convey, with reasonable clarity to those skilled in art, that applicant, as of filing date sought, was in possession of invention, with invention being, for purposes of "written description" inquiry, whatever is presently claimed."

Art Unit: 1637

In the application at the time of filing, there is no record or description which would demonstrate conception of any nucleic acids other than those expressly disclosed which "hybridizes to the DNA of claim 17". Therefore, the claims fail to meet the written description requirement by encompassing sequences which are not described in the specification.

### Allowable Subject Matter

- 4. Claims 17-22 are allowed.
- 5. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: These sequences are novel and unobvious because the Chang patent expressly excludes a region of the sequence now claimed. The SstI fragment is absent from Chang and from Chang's clone, rendering Chang unable to anticipate or make obvious claims which encompass this SstI fragment region. Applicant correctly contends that these claims encompass that region and are therefore unobvious over Chang. Therefore, these claims are novel and unobvious.

### Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jeffrey Fredman whose telephone number is (571)272-0742. The examiner can normally be reached on 6:30-4:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gary Benzion can be reached on (571)272-0782. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 1637

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Jeffrey Fredman Primary Examiner Art Unit 1637 Page 6